



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/745,290	12/20/2000	Adam L. Berger	12481-002001	6981

7590

02/14/2005

Nokia, Inc.
Attn: Ian L. Cartier
313 Fairchild Drive
Mountain View, CA 94043

EXAMINER

SMITH, PETER J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/745,290

Applicant(s)

BERGER ET AL.

Examiner

Peter J Smith

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 November 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 32 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: application filed on 11/1/2004.
2. Claims 1-32 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 26, 27 and 28 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 32 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 32 depends on itself. The Examiner assumes dependent claim 32 is meant by Applicant to depend on independent claim 1 and will thus examine claim 32 as depending on independent claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1-11, 14-24, 26-28, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Adams et al. (hereinafter “Adams”), US 6,457,030 B1 filed 1/29/1999.**

Regarding independent claim 1, Adams discloses altering portions of a text of an original version of a digital document to produce a revised version of the digital document in which the text is shorter than the text of the original document, the altering being done based on preferences associated with a device in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. In these

Art Unit: 2176

sections Adams shows that text elements may be reformatted or split into multiple text elements and the elements may be removed based on priority values attached to the elements. In col. 3 lines 56-59 Adams specifically discusses subdividing text elements for display on a pervasive computing device. The retrieved content modification file determines how the web page content is modified for a particular device. Altering the content modification file can customize the transformation for different devices. Adams discloses receiving over a communication channel a request for the digital document from the device and transmitting the revised version over the communication channel in response to the request in fig. 1A and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Adams discloses applying more than one transformation selectively to the text in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. The retrieved content modification file selectively invokes transformations upon the web page content so that the transmitted file is properly displayed on the destination device in accordance with the preferences of the device.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Adams discloses applying transformations to the text based on preferences associated with the device in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. The retrieved content modification file selectively invokes transformations upon the web page content so that the transmitted file is properly displayed on the destination device in accordance with the preferences of the device.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Adams discloses that the preferences are associated with the device based on a unique identifier of the device in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. The content modification file contains transformation information unique to the requesting device and is retrieved based a unique identifier of the requesting device.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Adams discloses that the preferences are stored in advance of the request for a document in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. The preferences are stored in advance in the content modification file.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Adams discloses that the preferences are stored in a database associated with a server in col. 6 lines 3-19.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Adams discloses that the preferences are indicated by a user through an interface of the device in col. 4 lines 7-10.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Adams discloses that the preferences of the user are stored in a content modification file located in a database associated with the server and the user preferences are selected via an interface other than the device from which the request for the digital document is made in col. 4 lines 7-10 and col. 6 line 3-19.

Regarding dependent claim 9, Adams discloses that the content modification file is stored in a database associated with a server and the content modification file may be accessed and modified with a form in col. 6 lines 3-19.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Adams discloses that the preferences are stored for each device from which requests for documents may be received in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. There is a corresponding content modification file available for retrieval for each device.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Adams discloses that the preferences are stored for each device from which requests for documents may be received in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. There is a corresponding content modification file available for retrieval for each device.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Adams discloses a content modification file for each device containing information for determining how the transformation of the document is performed in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11.

Regarding dependent claim 15, Adams discloses receiving information from the device identifying the type of device in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. The device requests its corresponding content modification file, thus identifying itself to the server.

Regarding dependent claim 16, Adams discloses altering the document at a proxy server in fig. 2 and col. 4 line 64 – col. 5 line 11.

Regarding dependent claim 17, Adams discloses altering the document at an origin server in fig. 2 and col. 4 line 64 – col. 5 line 11.

Regarding dependent claim 18, Adams discloses a device that is not configured to display the entire document at one time in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11.

Regarding dependent claim 19, Adams discloses a device comprising a personal digital assistant, a hand-held device, or a telephone in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11.

Regarding dependent claim 20, Adams discloses altering comprising date compression in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. Adams discloses replacing page elements with alternative elements and modifying individual elements for display on the device.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Adams discloses altering comprising word abbreviation in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. Adams discloses replacing page elements with alternative elements and modifying individual elements for display on the device.

Regarding dependent claim 22, Adams discloses altering comprising reducing the size of an image included in the original document in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11.

Art Unit: 2176

Adams discloses replacing page elements with alternative elements and modifying individual elements for display on the device. Adams discloses a motivation for reducing the image in col. 2 lines 26-46.

Regarding dependent claim 23, Adams discloses reducing includes image compression, resampling, or conversion from color to black-and-white in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. Adams discloses replacing page elements with alternative elements and modifying individual elements for display on the device. Adams discloses a motivation for reducing the image in col. 2 lines 26-46.

Regarding dependent claim 24, Adams discloses that the digital document is a web page in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11.

Regarding independent claim 26, Adams discloses maintaining a database that defines preferences associated with different client devices with respect to preferred alterations to be performed on full web pages requested by client devices that are not configured to display full web pages, the alterations making the documents more suitable for display on the client devices in fig. 1-2, col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11, and col. 6 lines 3-19.

Regarding independent claim 27, Adams discloses obtaining from a client device information about preferences with respect to preferred alterations to be performed on full documents requested by a client device that is not configured to display the full documents and associating the preferences with the client device in a database in fig. 1-2, col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11, and col. 6 lines 3-19.

Regarding independent claim 28, Adams discloses creating content for web pages to be served to types of client devices that are not configured to display full web pages and storing

Art Unit: 2176

information about transformations that are to be made to the full web pages to make them suitable for display on the client devices, the stored information associated each of the types of devices with transformations to be made to the full web pages requested by the type of device in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11.

Regarding dependent claim 30, Adams discloses altering portions of a text based on preferences associated with a device and independent of an association with the digital document in col. 6 lines 39-40. In the cited section Adams discloses that the altering is based on the preferences and characteristics associated with the requesting device.

Regarding dependent claim 31, Adams discloses altering portions of a text based on preferences related to at least one capability of the device in col. 6 lines 39-40. In the cited section Adams discloses that the altering is based on the preferences and characteristics associated with the requesting device.

Regarding dependent claim 32, Adams discloses altering portions of a text based on preferences related to at least one capability of the device, and independent of a relation to an ability of a user of the device in col. 6 lines 39-40. In the cited section Adams discloses that the altering is based on the preferences and characteristics associated with the requesting device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al. (hereinafter “Adams”), US 6,457,030 B1 filed 1/29/1999.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Adams teaches storing preferences for a particular device in a content modification file in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Adams so that the content modification file was located locally on the device itself so that the transmission of the content modification file would not have been necessary, thus allowing a faster transmission of the requested document to the device.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Adams teaches storing preferences for a particular device in a content modification file in fig. 1-2 and col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11. The content modification file is a collection of metadata which includes information to determine how the document is transformed for the requesting device. A cookie is metadata contained locally on a browser to determine how a web page is to be displayed on the device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Adams to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious to have put the content modification file data into a cookie and stored it locally on the requesting device so that the content modification information would have taken advantage of the cookie feature of the browser software installed on the requesting device. This would have reduced the transmission of data required for the requesting device to receive.

Art Unit: 2176

8. Claims 25 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al. (hereinafter “Adams”), US 6,457,030 B1 filed 1/29/1999 in view of Halahmi, US 6,684,088 B1 filed 3/1/2000.

Regarding dependent claim 25, Adams does not teach segmenting a digital document into subdocuments, and transmitting fewer than all of the segments in response to a request. Halahmi does teach segmenting a digital document into subdocuments, and transmitting fewer than all of the segments in response to a request in fig. 5-6, col. 4 lines 49-67, and col. 10 line 57 – col. 15 line 12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Halahmi into Adams to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the document segmenting of Halahmi to have further reduced the amount of data transmitted to the requesting device of Adams.

Regarding dependent claim 29, Adams does not teach that the digital document comprises and email. Halahmi does teach that the digital document comprises and email in fig. 1-2, the abstract, and col. 2 line 60 – col. 3 line 39. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Halahmi into Adams to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have modified Adams so that it could have received email since small, low power, and low bandwidth devices such as the requesting devices are commonly used by people to access email accounts.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 11/1/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding Applicant's argument on page 8 that Adams does not teach altering portions of an original version of a digital document based on preferences associated with the device, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Adams discloses that the altering is performed based on preferences and characteristics associated with each kind of client device in col. 3 lines 47-59 and col. 6 lines 39-40. While the content modification file contains the information how to perform each type of transformation, the characteristics and preferences of the requesting pervasive client device must be used as input on how to alter the original document, otherwise all transformations would be identical. Adams clearly discloses that the transformation performed on the original document is dependent on the pervasive device which will display the document. Adams points out the advantage of this in col. 3 line 60 – col. 4 line 4 saying that using Adams, there is a need for only one original document, which can then be transcoding on-demand for immediate display within virtually any type of computing device that requests the Web content file. Regarding Applicant's argument in page 9 that Adams does not disclose maintaining a database of preferences associated with different client devices, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner believes Adams discloses this in fig. 1-2, col. 3 line 21 – col. 4 line 11, and col. 6 lines 3-19. Adams also discloses maintaining a data structure organizing device preferences and content transformation information associated with those preferences in fig. 3 and 4.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4101. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
2/9/2005


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER